Sn. 09/826,557

ATTORNEY DOCKET No. CANO:023

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 14, 17, 19, and 20 have been amended to improve their form, namely changing "methods" to —protocols—, as well as to remove the informality in claim 8 identified by the examiner. Applicant submits that the intent of this amendment is not to narrow the claims, but to merely make editorial changes, which are not germane to patentability of the claims. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Johnson (USP 6,248,996) in view of Fujino (USP 6,476,935). Applicant traverses this rejection because the combination would not have taught associating a same predetermined identifier with all of the transmissions of the same data, as set forth in independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 20.

Independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 20 call for transmitting the same data to a plurality of destination using respective different transmission protocols, and using a same predetermined identifier associated with all of the transmissions of the same data. When the same data is sent by the respective different transmission protocols, the different transmissions of the same data can be collectively managed, such as collectively interrupting the transmissions (see Fig. 8) using the same predetermined identifier.

Johnson discloses simultaneously transmitting the same image data to a plurality of receiver destinations. Johnson, however, transmits the same image data via the same transmission protocol and does not disclose or teach using a same predetermined identifier associated with all of the transmissions of the same data. As Johnson lacks the above-identified claimed features, the examiner applied Fujino for the proposition that using a same predetermined identifier associated with all of the transmissions of the same data would have been obvious. Applicant submits that Fujino is silent regarding associating any identifier(s) with all of the transmissions of the same data.

Specifically, Fujino discloses a data communication apparatus that simultaneously transmits identical data to a plurality of destinations using a plurality of lines/data channels. Fujino also does not teach using different transmission protocols to transmit the same data. Moreover, even if the lines/data channels were to correspond to different transmission protocols

SN. 09/826,557

12/06/05 DATE **ATTORNEY DOCKET No. CANO:023**

for argument's sake. Fujino would not have disclosed or taught associating the same predetermined identifier to all of a plurality of transmissions of the identical data.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1-22 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

MARC A. ROSSI REG. No. 31,923

P.O. Box 826 ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE) 703-726-6024 (FAX)